

Optimizing Transition Services Programs

M. Alewine

2/6/12

B8595H0  
2.067-2  
Copy 1

Optimizing Transition Services Programs:

Development of Effective Program Models

Margaret Alewine

South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department (SCVRD)

February 6, 2012

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

JUL 30 2012

STATE DOCUMENTS

### **Statement of the Problem**

The provision of transition services to students with disabilities is a collaborative effort among school districts, vocational rehabilitation agencies and other service agencies. Both school districts and state vocational rehabilitation agencies have requirements related to transition services outlined in their authorizing legislation. According to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, vocational rehabilitation agencies have specified in their scope of services to provide transition services that are a “coordinated set of activities for students designed within an outcome-oriented process that promotes movement from school to post-school activities, including post-secondary education, vocational training, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation.” (U.S. Department of Education, <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/reg/narrative.html> ). Transition students are the one population that is specifically targeted in the authorizing legislation, and has been a particular focus both at the national level and within the South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department (SCVRD). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 specifies that schools must provide transition services that are a “coordinated set of activities for a student with a disability that is designed to be within a results-oriented process” (U.S. Department of Education, <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/leg/edpicks.jhtml>). The intent is to improve the academic and functional achievement of the student with a disability to facilitate their movement from school to post-school activities.

Measures of accountability that apply to transition services include indicators that schools and states report on annually. These include indicators related to graduation rates, drop-out rates, parental involvement, inclusion of appropriate post-secondary goals for students with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) that are updated annually and based on appropriate transition assessment,

transition services and courses of study that will assist the student in meeting those goals, and post-school outcomes for students with IEP's. Specific to South Carolina, the Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA) of 2005 includes transition-related elements that include career exploration, alignment of courses of study with a career major/career cluster, and extended learning opportunities such as internships and job shadows (SC Commission on Higher Education, <http://www.che.sc.gov/AcademicAffairs/EEDA/EEDA.htm> ).

Academic outcomes for students with disabilities have been much lower than those for students without disabilities. According to the SC Department of Education annual report card for 2011 (National Assessment of Educational Progress), the percentage of eighth grade students with disabilities that were below basic level for mathematics was 71%, compared to 30% of students overall. The percentage of eighth grade students with disabilities that were below basic level for reading was 70%, compared to 28% of students overall (South Carolina Department of Education website, <http://ed.sc.gov/data/national-assessments/documents/SCNAEP2011.pdf> ).

According to results from the 2009 American Community Survey, individuals with disabilities ages 21-64 were employed at a rate of 36% nationally, and 30.1% in South Carolina. This is compared to 76.8% of individuals without a disability that were employed nationally and 74.7% in South Carolina (Cornell University Resource for Disability Statistics, <http://disabilitystatistics.org/> ). This is a considerable gap in employment rates that often places individuals with disabilities in a cycle of dependence and poverty. Median annual earnings for individuals with a disability who were working full-time averaged \$35,000 nationally, and \$31,000 in South Carolina; individuals without a disability averaged \$41,000 nationally and \$36,000 in South Carolina (Cornell University Resource for Disability Statistics, <http://disabilitystatistics.org/> ). Lower levels of earnings, coupled with strikingly lower rates of

employment clearly identify the need for effective programs to assist individuals with disabilities to achieve competitive employment, and particularly programs for students.

The South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department (SCVRD) has placed an emphasis on transition services for students with disabilities in recent years. Comparative data from the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) for FY 2009 indicates that the percentage of transition aged clients served to total clients served was 24.59%, (defined as age 15 to 24), compared to 33.24% nationally and 34.22% among peer agencies (Rehabilitation Services Administration, <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/rsa/index.html> ). Efforts to increase the number of students served as well as reviewing the methods of providing those services necessitates review of the current model for transition programs that are in place, review of other programs that have proven to be effective, and evidence-based practices for delivering quality services that ultimately improve the employment outcomes for students with disabilities.

Resources play a tremendous role in the ability to shift programmatic focus and implement methods of improving outcomes for students with disabilities. In a time when funding for programs in the social services and educational arenas have been dramatically reduced, the efforts to use both systems' resources to their fullest potential in a collaborative and strategic fashion is critical. However, implementing effective programs is not a "one size fits all" approach, as there are currently 86 school districts in the state, each with differing levels of resources, differences in programmatic focus, and different approaches to decision-making. This requires a site-by-site approach to relationship building and program implementation to best meet the mutual needs of individual school districts and SCVRD service delivery areas in their quest to better serve the students with disabilities that need and require services to have a greater chance of achieving economic independence through competitive employment at a level that can meet their needs over the course of a lifetime.



### **Data Collection**

Data for school districts and specific high schools was collected to evaluate certain parameters that impact transition services (Appendix B). These included: percentage of students with disabilities (representing the potential pool of SCVRD client referrals), annual drop-out rates, percentage of students participating in a work-based experience, dollars spent per pupil, High School Assessment Program (HSAP) exam passage rate for all students and for students with disabilities, and on-time graduation rates for all students and for students with disabilities. The purpose of collecting this data was to assess the following factors: 1) number of students potentially eligible for SCVRD services; 2) resource levels; 3) performance levels; 4) performance gaps between students with and without identified disabilities, and 5) items that may be impacted by an effective array of transition services, such as drop-out rates. The schools/school districts identified for the data analysis included: Strom Thurmond High School (Edgefield school district), Sumter High School (Sumter District 17), Swansea High School (Lexington District 4), Laurens High School (Laurens District 55), Greenville School District, Georgetown High School (Georgetown school district), Spartanburg District 2, Spartanburg High School (Spartanburg District 7), Chester Senior High School (Chester school district), and Irmo High School (Lexington District 5). The selection protocol for identifying particular schools/school districts was structured to include a variety of schools: large and small, urban and rural, and diverse with regard to economic resources. In addition, districts that have an existing SCVRD demonstration grant or specialty transition program in place were included as well as those that have the potential for expanded services to be explored.

SCVRD data was also gathered and analyzed. This included: 1) current level of staff resources dedicated to transition services in specified locations; 2) new referrals and outcomes; 3) numbers served and outcomes for specific programs such as High School/High Tech (HS/HT) and Youth Employment Services (YES) that have utilized the National Collaborative on Work and Disability for Youth's (NCWD/Y) "Guideposts for Success" as a framework for the programs (Institute for Educational Leadership, <http://www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html>); 4) variability in students attending SCVRD Work Training Centers; and 5) topical review of transition cases to identify potential gaps in staff training and to assess the degree of implementation of the current SCVRD model for transition services. In addition, program development scenarios were outlined to demonstrate the budgetary impact of collaborative funding with school districts for several levels of programmatic involvement.

Research on existing models of transition services was conducted. These program models were evaluated and commonalities examined for potential implementation. Examples of these models included: the Iowa state vocational rehabilitation agency's approach to structuring collaborative service delivery with school districts (Allison, R. and Guy, B., 2011), Project SEARCH ([www.projectsearch.us](http://www.projectsearch.us)), Maryland Seamless Transition project (Luecking et. al., [http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash\\_2011/ppt/session11\\_luecking.pdf](http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash_2011/ppt/session11_luecking.pdf)), seamless transition projects from Delaware and Washington (Butterworth, J. et. al, [http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash\\_2011/ppt/session10\\_butterworth.pdf](http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash_2011/ppt/session10_butterworth.pdf)), Project Discovery school-based curriculum (Education Associates, 2001), and the MYTI project from Mississippi (Marc Gold and Associates, 2005). In addition, findings on effective categories of transition service provision from the National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability/Youth (Institute for Educational Leadership, [www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html](http://www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html)) and the NSTTAC Positive Predictors of Post-School Success

(National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center, [www.nsttac.org](http://www.nsttac.org) ), which under gird the framework of transition services provided by SCVRD, were also integrated into the data analysis.

### **Data Analysis**

Review of data from the Department of Education points to the variability among school districts with regard to funding per pupil, performance on indicators such as HSAP testing and graduation rates, as well as significant gaps in performance for students with disabilities as compared to students without identified disabilities (Appendix B – School Report Card statistics). On-time graduation rates for all students ranged from 64.3% to 83.1%, while graduation rates for students with disabilities ranged from 26.8% to 57.5%. Items of particular interest for development of transition programs included drop-out rates, which ranged from a low of 1.7% to a high of 7.7%. SCVRD's Youth Employment Services (YES) program, a demonstration grant program, identifies drop-out prevention as one of its key outcome goals. Outcome data from the YES program demonstrates higher graduation rates for program participants, lower drop-out rates, and higher rates of post-secondary education enrollment or achievement of employment after exiting high school. Through the use of a variety of "Guidepost" driven activities and work experiences, students not only maintain interest in completing school but also exit school better prepared to enter the world of work or post-secondary training/education. The data examined from the school district points to the need for programs that retain the key components that have been proven effective (as outlined in the SCVRD Matrix of Services, attachment A), while being flexible enough to be tailored to the particular needs of each individual school district. For example, the percentage of students with disabilities identified by the school districts ranged from 5.6% (Boiling Springs HS) to 15.4% (Strom Thurmond High School). Analysis of dropout rates also showed variability, ranging from 1.7% (Irmo HS) to 7.7% (Chester HS). As far as dollars spent per pupil, this ranged from \$5,986 (Strom Thurmond HS) to \$9,640 (Chesnee HS). Even within one



school district, there was variation in dollars spent per pupil, as Chesnee HS reported \$9,640 per pupil and Boiling Springs HS reported \$7,025 per pupil, with both schools being in Spartanburg District 2.

Appendix B outlines the comparative school report card data.

Review of current level of SCVRD resources dedicated to transition programs shows varying levels of staffing among the different geographical locations (Appendix B, Transition Programs and SCVRD staffing). Areas that have a specialized program, such as High School/High Tech, Transition Services Specialist programs (TSS) or YES, may have an increased level of staffing by nature of having the program in place. Analysis of the data related to specialty transition programs and SCVRD staffing shows that locations with no specialized program and limited or undefined SCVRD hours had the lowest number of referrals and the least amount of successful employment outcomes for students receiving SCVRD services (Appendix B, Transition programs and SCVRD staffing). When these types of VR outcomes were compared to other factors such as school district dollars spent per-pupil, there did not appear to be a clear connection, as one of the districts with the lowest spending (Chester) had similar results to one of the districts with a higher rate of spending per pupil (Irmo HS). When analyzed in conjunction with annual dropout rate data, the three districts with the highest dropout rates (Chester, Spartanburg 7, and Laurens 55) had varying levels of SCVRD staffing and specialized programs (Appendix B). The Transition Services Specialist (TSS) programs are an example of blended resources, in that SCVRD allocates additional funding and staff oversight for the programs and the school allocates staff to perform the duties outlined in the program's Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). For the purposes of this project, the TSS model of services was used as a baseline for creating tailored program proposals that increases the total program budget without significant increase to the school district's outlay of funding or resources through access of matching funds. At a time when school districts must make difficult budget choices that impact such programs, providing an alternative that may keep an effective



program in place is critical. In the past fiscal year, at least one successful TSS program was unable to continue due to lack of funding available from the school district. By creatively approaching the blending of funding streams, this may be used as an approach to maximize resources. Attachment C outlines several example proposals.

In keeping with the use of evidence-based practices, outcome data for two SCVRD programs that utilize the "Guideposts for Success" (Institute for Educational Leadership, [www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html](http://www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html)) as a framework was analyzed. The YES program is a demonstration grant that is currently in year 5 of its implementation. Through year 4 of the grant, outcome data shows that graduation rates for YES program participants exiting high school were higher than the school averages for students with disabilities. Of the students in the YES program that exited high school in year 3 or 4 of the program, 112 (63%) earned a high school diploma or alternative diploma, well above average graduation rates for students with disabilities at the participating schools. Of the 89 students in the YES program who exited high school prior to 2011, 28 achieved employment and 29 are enrolled in post-secondary education (a 64% success rate). Two critical factors that have been identified through the grant evaluation process include the following: 1) emphasis on work experiences, with student having the opportunity for paid work experiences while in school, is a compelling arbiter for curbing drop-outs and behavioral infractions; and 2) having SCVRD staff embedded in the school and viewed as a part of the schools' program makes a difference in how the program is perceived and supported by school staff, parents and students. Similar results have been achieved by the High School/High Tech programs, which are designed to provide career exploration to students with disabilities with interests in the areas of science, technology, engineering and math.

SCVRD has 19 work training centers located around the state to provide job readiness training for clients. A review of data related to the use of the work training centers by students revealed that

while some areas have well-established relationships with the local school districts and structured programs to bring students in for work experiences, at least 8 locations had no students attending the work training centers as of the time of data collection. This can be a valuable resource and tool for building partnerships with school districts and meeting the students' need for exposure to the world of work. Utilizing a structured approach based on what has worked for similar locations to assist those locations that do not have robust student programs at the Work Training Centers is needed.

A random review of cases, using a standardized review checklist, was conducted to assess adherence to the current model of transition services outlined for use by SCVRD staff. The purpose of the review was two-fold: 1) to assess the impact of existing training and staff development conducted around the topic of transition; and 2) to identify next steps in staff development and training needed to build the capability of staff involved in delivering transition services. Results of the case review included the following key actionable findings: 1) many transition referrals are coming late in the student's high school career, not allowing time to deliver the full range of transition services; 2) provision of group activities based on the Guideposts for Success are not reflected in the case documentation; 3) coordination of the students' stated interests on the school Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and the interests identified on the SCVRD vocational assessment, or explanation of the divergence, is not evident; and 4) there are gaps in contact with students.

Transition program models, selected in part due to their outcome data and use as "best-practice" models in training and conference settings, from around the country were examined to identify what key concepts and commonalities existed within effective programs. Some of the key concepts included the following:

- Work experience (especially paid work experience) is critical;

- A structured approach to providing internships;
- Staff training involves both rehabilitation service providers and school partners;
- Starting with students well before the end of their time in school (the earlier, the better);
- Job development is customized, with designated staff for this function;
- Use of an extended period of assessment;
- Parental involvement and benefits planning are included;
- Effective coordination among service providers and schools is evident;
- An overarching goal is “seamless transition” – the last day of school looks same as the first day out of school; connections with service providers and post-secondary disability services offices are made well before the student exits school;
- Importance of placement efforts, before the student leaves school;
- Guidepost-driven programs (Institute for Educational Leadership, [www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html](http://www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html) )

Based upon this review, I have concluded that the following potential solutions and action plans for the items identified in the data analysis fall roughly into three categories: 1) capability development (staff training/staff development/skill building); 2) programmatic consistency in key concepts; and 3) resource optimization (capacity assessment and development; increasing level of resources through braided funding streams).



**Implementation Plan Outline**

- Action steps
  - Create a strategic training plan for internal staff centered on key concepts. Small group, interactive sessions with clearly outlined objectives and next steps to assess the impact of the training are to be included. An annual training schedule, with topics cycling in at specified intervals, is an end goal. This will be accomplished collaboratively by the SCVRD transition team and HRD training department, and will include input from key staff members in the field.
  - Create strategic training plan for external partners (school staff) on topics such as collaboration in transition planning for students, building a cohesive structure for referrals, career exploration/work experiences and connecting services. An existing grant with the SC Department of Education has identified an objective for professional development strategies for school personnel related to secondary transition services, and can be used as a framework for developing the initial content in limited locations. Ultimately, this plan should be rolled out to local areas so that local field staff can utilize a consistent approach to educating referral sources and building programmatic strength.
  - Design and implement a structured quality review process for transition services to be conducted at designated intervals to check for programmatic consistency with key concepts. This will be structured using a two-tiered approach: local reviews and feedback, with a secondary statewide sample review. Local staff and state office

transition team members will conduct the review, and results will be utilized within a Plan – Do – Check – Act framework.

- Conduct a capacity assessment for each SCVRD area in conjunction with the annual caseload goal-setting process, comparing the required staffing needed to support the programmatic requirements and school partners' identified programmatic needs with existing staffing/resources. When possible, allocate dedicated staffing to transition programs (rather than splitting caseloads between transition and adult service populations). This will be conducted by State Office management and local area supervisors.
- Resource optimization: Conduct outreach meetings with selected sites to discuss capacity development proposals for blended funding (Attachment B includes examples). Initial outreach will be conducted by local supervisors with input/direction from State Office management. Initial sites will be selected based on existing programs that can be optimized, and areas of need that can benefit from resource optimization.
- Timeframes and cost
  - Internal strategic training plan development will begin with a six-month timeline, including identification of critical topics that can be expedited. Project planning will be employed to more clearly define realistic timelines. Cost includes travel for participants (when not conducted locally), and potential fees if conferences/webinars/speakers are involved. The external training plan will include not only collaborative efforts through an existing SC Department of Education grant (which is dependent on timeframes

identified by the grant director), but also locally-based efforts through area transition staff that meet with school partners on a regular/routine basis.

- Structured quality review will target a three-month timeframe for implementation. A baseline for the quality review has been developed through this project, which will be refined and discussed with senior management for approval prior to implementation. Additional input from field staff is desired prior to roll out.
- Capacity assessment will occur over the next five months, with completion required prior to July 1.
- Resource optimization process has begun, with development of programmatic/budget proposals in draft form. Initial discussions in several locations are underway, with follow-up meetings to occur over the next three months for selected sites. This process is expected to continue over the course of the next year as program development continues.
- Potential obstacles related to training include staff time required outside of their core duties, as well as gaining acceptance and commitment from external partners. Methods to overcome this include adequate planning of the training objectives and measures of impact, gaining input from participants on how to best meet their needs, and aligning training topics with the key concepts identified for effective programs. Program expansion and capacity assessment includes the potential obstacle of maintaining balance in SCVRD referrals – the volume of students is great and the local areas must balance the need to expand transition programs with the need to meet the community's needs for all other eligible consumers. Methods to overcome this are imbedded in the process for analyzing area by area how the resources are best structured to



meet the needs of the community and by continuing to approach programmatic development with the concept of blended funding to increase available levels of resources. Sustainability in staffing is also a key consideration: if programs are dependent on combined funding from SCVRD and school districts there must be contingency planning for potentially shifting budget landscapes.

- Potential resources to be explored include not only restructuring of funding to ensure the highest level of resources are accessed through matching funds, but also grant opportunities that are available and are in keeping with the programmatic direction of the Agency and its partners. If successful, restructuring an existing program that costs the Agency \$20,000 per year could result in a program budget that is roughly four times that amount.
- Communication with key stakeholders will require an internal and external communication plan. Agency staff members are aware of the current focus on transition services, and continued communication of the key concepts required for effective transition programs will continue through structured training, communication through supervisory channels, and at the local field office level. Communication with school partners has included outreach at the state level, and will continue through contacts at the district and individual school level.
- Integration into standard operating procedures will require a clear outline of the programmatic key concepts, revision of policy manuals to be consistent with the key concepts, and use of the aforementioned Plan-Do-Check-Act methodology.

#### **Evaluation Method**

The proposed solutions will include a structured evaluation process. For training initiatives, the development phase must include a clear method for assessing the impact on performance. Input data

on number of referrals will continue to be analyzed. Additional data related to improvement on the timing of referrals (i.e. beginning of junior year) will be gathered, as well as data on adherence to key program concepts as gathered through the structured quality review. Output data will be analyzed to assess improvement in the following parameters: 1) employment outcomes for students that received transition services; 2) increases in post-secondary training/education; and 3) decreases in unsuccessful case closures for students receiving effective transition services.

School district feedback will be obtained through counterpart meetings, survey methods as well as local staff interaction. In addition, input from the parents and community will be obtained in a similar fashion.

#### **Summary and Recommendations**

In summary, there are over 25,000 students with disabilities in the states' high schools, as identified by data from the SC Department of Education (SC Dept. of Education, <http://ed.sc.gov/>). The data shows that students with disabilities perform at lower levels on end of course academic tests, have lower graduation rates, and have much lower rates of employment than their non-disabled peers. The needs are great with regard to supportive and structured approaches to enhancing their ability to succeed and achieve meaningful careers that can sustain them over the course of their lifetimes. Transition services are mandated as requirements for both the educational components and rehabilitation agencies in the states. Crafting collaborative programs to enhance available resources and employing evidence-based practices is critical. This project outlines a methodology for expanding programs in the current budgetary climate while also meeting the needs of students receiving services through those programs.

## References

- Allison, R. and Guy, B. *VR and DE Collaboration in Iowa: Redesigning the Relationship*. PowerPoint Presentation, 11-28-11.
- Butterworth, J. et. al.  
[http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash\\_2011/ppt/session10\\_butterworth.pdf](http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash_2011/ppt/session10_butterworth.pdf)
- Cornell University, disability statistics from American community survey:  
<http://disabilitystatistics.org/>
- Institute for Educational Leadership, <http://www.iel.org/programs/ncwd.html> ), National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability/Youth
- Lehmann, E. and Mauer, S. Education Associates, Inc. *Project Discovery*. 2010: Louisville, KY.
- Luecking, R. et. al; Maryland Seamless Transition Program;  
[http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash\\_2011/ppt/session11\\_luecking.pdf](http://tacesoutheast.org/events/tash_2011/ppt/session11_luecking.pdf)
- Marc Gold and Associates, 2005.  
<http://www.marcgold.com/myti/presentations/mytipresentationJUNE2005.pdf>
- National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC): <http://www.nsttac.org/>
- Project Search: <http://www.projectsearch.us/>
- Rehabilitation Services Administration:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/rsa/index.html>
- SC Department of Education: <http://ed.sc.gov/>
- Seamless Transition: <http://www.seamlesstransition.org/>
- TACE Southeast: <http://tacesoutheast.org/network/transition/index.php>
- Transcen, Inc.: <http://www.transcen.org/>



# Transition from School to Work Service Matrix

## Appendix A

Guideposts For Success	Preparatory Experiences	Work Experiences	Personal Development and Leadership	Connecting Services	Family Involvement
NSTTAC Predictors of Positive Post-School Outcomes	Career Awareness	Paid Employment Work Experiences Work Study	Community Experiences Self Advocacy Self Determination	Interagency Collaboration	Parental Involvement
SCVRD Provided/Arranged Services	ACE Assessment Career Exploration Workforce Trends Field Trips to Post-Secondary Training Job Seeking and Survival Skills Instruction Counseling And Guidance Guest Speakers	Job Readiness Training On-the-Job Tryout Internships Participation in Work Experiences provided through other entities Job Shadowing Site Visits to Industry Part-Time Jobs	Youth Leadership Forum (YLF) Junior Achievement Participation in Service Learning Participation in school sponsored extra-curricular activities Exposure to role models Mentoring Youth Leadership Activities, i.e. self advocacy, building confidence and, communication skills Disability History, Culture, and Policy Goal Setting	Diagnosis and Treatment Rehabilitation Technology Post-Secondary Training Information and Referral to other Community Services Providers Personal Assistance Services Transportation Benefits Planning Tutoring Maintenance Interpreter Services Occupational licenses, tools, equipment, etc. <b>JOB PLACEMENT</b> Supported Employment	Consultation with parent(s)/guardian(s) regarding assessments, services, progress and outcomes  Communicating Transitioning Planning

Appendix B			
<b>2011 School Report Card info</b>	<b>Percentage with disabilities</b>	<b>Total students w/ disabilities</b>	<b>Annual dropout rate</b>
Aiken - YES (STHS)	15.40%	148	4.50%
Sumter - HS/HT (Sumter HS)	11.70%	329	1.80%
Swansea - TSS	16.60%	154	4.80%
Laurens - TSS (Laurens 55 HS)	9.30%	181	6.90%
Greenville - TSS; HS/HT (district-wide info)	8.20%	2234 (district-wide)	2.80%
Georgetown HS - TSS	12.60%	141	2.10%
Spartanburg Dist. 2 - Boiling Springs	5.60%	122	2.70%
Spartanburg Dist. 2 - Chesnee	10.10%	89	2.30%
Spartanburg Dist. 7 - Spartanburg HS	10.90%	203	7%
Chester senior HS	9.60%	172 (district-wide)	7.70%
Lexington-Richland 5 - Irmo HS	10.10%	219 (Irmo HS)	1.70%
*Source: SC Dept of Education			

Students participating in work-based experiences	Dollars spent per pupil	HSAP passage rate - all	HSAP passage rate - SWD	On-time grad rate-all	OT grad - swd
9.6% (down from 23.3% prior year)	\$5,986	88.90%	48.60%	72%	54.80%
12.20%	\$6,946	90.90%	58.80%	77.10%	49.10%
0.10%	\$7,794	83.90%	48.50%	66.10%	28%
13%	\$6,166	91%	60.50%	64.30%	31.10%
	\$7,662	92.50%	61.70%	72.20%	41.10%
4.50%	\$8,591	93.60%	63.30%	83.10%	55%
78.3% (down from 97%)	\$7,025	93.50%	54.80%	80%	51.60%
96.2% (up from 67.1%)	\$9,640	92.70%	63.20%	79.50%	60%
3.50%	\$9,070	90.60%	38%	67.60%	26.80%
16%	\$6,617	86.90%	52.60%	68.40%	37.50%
0.1% (down from 26.1%)	\$8,199	94.30%	57.90%	82.40%	57.50%
*Source: SC Dept of Education					



Partnership with \_\_\_\_\_ School DistrictYES Program – continuation/sustainabilityExample (For explanation purpose only, this is not the actual agreed budget) :

\_\_\_\_\_ County School District and SCVRD have developed a partnership to provide VR services to transition students who are eligible for VR services. \_\_\_\_\_ County School District will assist in identifying eligible students and coordinating with VR staff for scheduled Guidepost activities, job readiness training activities, work experiences, and job placement activities. Per the existing MOA between SCVRD and \_\_\_\_\_ School District, the school district will assist with transportation and supervision of students attending the SCVRD work training center. *Total budget will be dependent on whether a full time position is dedicated to this program – this staff may also provide job development and placement services. Number of students enrolled in program and number/duration of work experiences also impact total budget.*

\_\_\_\_\_ County School District will be responsible for 30% of the budget and SCVRD will be responsible for 70%.

One full time staff salary totals \$46,094 (includes 30% for fringes). The total budget for the program is \$56,824. \_\_\_\_\_ County School District will support the program with \$17,047.20 and SCVRD will support the program with \$39,776.80.

SCVRD will receive the monies from the school by certified time or cash transfer.

All students participating in the program must be VR clients. The program will be expected to maintain an active caseload of no less than 50 clients.

## Budget Example:

Salary - Position One	\$ 35,457.00
-----------------------	--------------

Fringes (30% of salary)	\$ 10,637.00
-------------------------	--------------

Work Experiences	\$ 10,730.00
------------------	--------------

	<u>\$ 56,824.00</u>
--	---------------------

	\$ 39,776.80
--	--------------

SCVRD Share (70%)	
-------------------	--

	\$ 17,047.20
--	--------------

County School District	
------------------------	--